

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 3-8, 10-11 and 13-25 are canceled herein.

Claim 1 is amended.

New claims 26-33 are added.

Support for the claim amendments and new claims is found, for example, in FIGS. 2 and 3, and the disclosure on page 3, lines 9-16; page 8, line 3, through page 9, line 14; page 10, line 22, through page 11, line 4, of the specification. See also operation 64 in FIG. 4.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 26-33 are currently pending.

II. OBJECTION TO THE AMENDMENT FILED 7/14/03 AND REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

All of the previously pending claims are canceled, except for claim 1 which is amended herein. Support for the amendments is found, for example, in FIGS. 2 and 3, and the disclosure on page 3, lines 9-16; page 8, line 3, through page 9, line 14; page 10, line 22, through page 11, line 4, of the specification. See also operation 64 in FIG. 4.

For example, the amended claim 1 refers to an analysis tool kit including a computer, a remotely-located call center and a video camera. For example, FIG. 2 shows analysis tool kit 30 and computer 32, remotely-located call center 11 and video camera 36.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection and rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 102(E) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY KAMIENIECKI

The present invention as recited, for example, in claim 29, relates to an apparatus comprising (a) a remote analysis computer, (b) a remotely-located call center, and (c) a video camera.

As recited in claim 29, the remote analysis computer is at a test site and communicates with a test and measurement device at the test site. The test and measurement device is coupled to a device under test via a connection.

As recited in claim 29, the call center communicates with the remote analysis computer to thereby to allow analysis of the device under test from the call center via communications

between the call center and the remote analysis computer and communications between the remote analysis computer and the test and measurement device.

As recited in claim 29, the video camera is at the test site and is directed on the connection to produce a video image of the connection. The video camera communicates with the remote analysis computer to transmit the video image to the call center through the remote analysis computer, to thereby allow the video image of the connection to be viewed at the call center.

Therefore, the present invention as recited, for example, in claim 29, is directed to the specific use of a video camera in a very specific configuration of a remote analysis computer and a remotely-located call center. For example, the video camera is directed to *a connection which couples a test and measurement device and a device under test*. Moreover, the video image is transmitted to the call center *through the remote analysis computer*.

For example, in FIG. 2, video camera 36 is directed to a connection which couples device under test 23 and test and measurement device 24. The video image is transmitted to call center 11 through computer 32.

This use of a video camera solves problems in conventional testing of a device under test as shown in FIG. 1.

Therefore, the present invention relates to the specific use of a video camera in a specific configuration for testing a device under test.

Kamieniecki discloses the use of a video camera. See, for example, DUT monitor 180 in FIG. 1 of Kamieniecki, and column 7, lines 27-40, of Kamieniecki.

However, in Kamieniecki, the video monitor is directed to a device under test to see if the device under test is operating properly. See, for example, column 7, lines 27-40, of Kamieniecki. Kamieniecki does not disclose or suggest that a video camera is directed to *a connection between device under test and test and measurement device* as recited, for example, in claim 29. Therefore, Kamieniecki is directed to a different problem than various embodiments of the present invention.

Moreover, in Kamieniecki, any video image produced by DUT monitor 180 is simply transmitted by line 185 to personal computer 115. See, for example, column 6, lines 56-64, of Kamieniecki. Kamieniecki does not disclose or suggest that the video image is transmitted to a call center *through a remote analysis computer* is a specific configuration as recited, for example, in claim 29.

The above-arguments are specifically directed to claim 29. However, it is believed that

the arguments would be helpful in understanding differences of other claims over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED
BY ZIEGRA

It is respectfully submitted that Ziegra does not disclose or suggest that a video camera is directed to a connection between device under test and test and measurement device as recited, for example, in claim 29.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Ziegra does not disclose or suggest that the video image of the connection is transmitted to a call center through a remote analysis computer in a specific configuration as recited, for example, in claim 29.

The above-arguments are specifically directed to claim 29. However, it is believed that the arguments would be helpful in understanding differences of other claims over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED
BY MOSER

It is respectfully submitted that Moser does not disclose or suggest that a video camera is directed to a connection between device under test and test and measurement device as recited, for example, in claim 29.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Moser does not disclose or suggest that the video image of the connection is transmitted to a call center through a remote analysis computer in a specific configuration as recited, for example, in claim 29.

The above-arguments are specifically directed to claim 29. However, it is believed that the arguments would be helpful in understanding differences of other claims over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VI. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER CHANDLER IN VIEW OF OFFICIAL NOTICE

It is respectfully submitted that Chandler does not disclose or suggest that a video

camera is directed to a connection between device under test and test and measurement device as recited, for example, in claim 29.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Chandler does not disclose or suggest that the video image of the connection is transmitted to a call center through a remote analysis computer in a specific configuration as recited, for example, in claim 29.

In fact, on page 9 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Chandler does not disclose the use of a video camera.

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ video cameras during remote testing of DUTs.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention does not simply recite the use of a video camera. Instead, as indicated above, the present invention relates to the specific use of a video camera in a specific configuration. It is respectfully submitted that such specific use in the specific configuration would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as evidenced by the problems with conventional testing of DUTs as indicated in FIG. 1 and the "Description of the Related Art" section of the present application.

The above-arguments are specifically directed to claim 29. However, it is believed that the arguments would be helpful in understanding differences of other claims over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VII. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER CHANDLER IN VIEW OF OFFICIAL NOTICE AND IN FURTHER VIEW
OF MANN, OR (KAMIENIECKI OR MOSER OR ZIEGRA) IN VIEW OF MANN

The above comments for distinguishing over Chandler, Official Notice, Kamieniecki, Moser and Ziegler also apply here.

It is respectfully submitted that Mann does not disclose or suggest that a video camera is directed to a connection between device under test and test and measurement device as recited, for example, in claim 29.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Mann does not disclose or suggest that the video image of the connection is transmitted to a call center through a remote analysis computer in a specific configuration as recited, for example, in claim 29.

The above-arguments are specifically directed to claim 29. However, it is believed that the arguments would be helpful in understanding differences of other claims over the cited references.


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2004

By: 
Paul I. Kravetz
Registration No. 35,230